arXiv:cond-mat/0012499v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 28 Dec 2000

# Empirical Calculations of the Formation Energies of Intrinsic Defects in Lithium Niobate

Shaoxin Feng, Qinghua Jin, Baohui Li, Zhenya Guo, Datong Ding

Department of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China

**Abstract**

Results of our shell-model calculations concerning the determination of empirical parameters of inter-ionic potentials and the formation energies of point defects in $LiNbO_3$ are presented. We employed the relaxed fitting method which is particularly appropriate for the modeling of low-symmetry structure. Attention is paid to guarantee the simulation precision of the parameters who are sensitive for defect formation energy calculations. It is shown that Li Frenkel disorders are the main intrinsic defects in stoichiometric lithium niobate and Li vacancy model is the dominant defect species in congruent lithium niobate.

## 1 Introduction

Lithium Niobate ($LiNbO_3$) is widely used ferroelectric material because of its favorable optical, piezoelectric, electro-optic, elastic, photoelectric and photorefractive properties. $LiNbO_3$ has a tendency to non-stoichiometry with R=[Li]/[Nb]$< 1$. Such crystals therefore have very high concentration of intrinsic defects.

The intrinsic defect structures of $LiNbO_3$ are widely investigated because many physical properties of the crystal depend to a certain extent on it. The required local charge neutrality can theoretically be guaranteed by one of the models listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Notations of the intrinsic defect structure of $LiNbO_3$

| Model No. | Parametric formula | Kröger-Vink notation | Authors |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | $Li_{1-2x}NbO_{3-x}$ | $2V_{Li}V_O$ | Fay[1] |
| 2 | $[Li_{1-5x}Nb_x]NbO_3$ | $Nb_{Li}4V_{Li}$ | Lerner[2] |
| 3 | $[Li_{1-5x}Nb_{5x}]Nb_{1-4x}O_3$ | $5Nb_{Li}4V_{Nb}$ | Abrahams[3] |

Model 1 was suggested by Fay *et al.* (in 1968) that $Li_2O$ deficiency in $LiNbO_3$ is accommodated by the formation of Li and O vacancies[1]. Model 2 was suggested by Lerner *et al.*

(in 1968) that, in crystals with R=[Li]/[Nb]$<$ 1, excess $Nb^{5+}$ ions are substituted for $Li^{+}$ in their sites. To satisfy the electro-neutrality condition, there will then arise lithium vacancies. The Nb sublattice is full occupied and every four vacant Li site (charge of -4) are statistically accompanied by one Li site occupied by a Nb ion (difference charge of +4 at this site)[2]. Model 3 was suggested by Abrahams and Marsh (in 1986), that the O sublattice remains 100%, where the excessive charge of five $Nb^{+5}$ ions on Li-site (charge of +20) is compensated by four vacant Nb-site (charge of -20)[3].

Although careful experimental investigation of the intrinsic defect structure have brought some insight into a microscopic understanding, there is no general agreement upon any one of the defect model[4].

Based on the shell model[5], Donnerberg *et al.* carried out pioneer atomic simulation studies on defects in $LiNbO_3$ crystals[6][4][7], by which they can then compare these defect structure models on the same energetic analysis in terms of their formation energies.

In such empirical approach the model parameters as well as the potential parameters are determined in terms of the empirical parameterization, i.e. all the parameters involved are adjusted to reproduce as closely as possible the measured crystal data.

Nevertheless, because of the low symmetry and the covalency cohesion involved for the ternary oxide lithium niobate, the practical limitations of the empirical parameterization bring about that either the residual strain will be present, if the crystal properties (cohesion, elastic constants, dielectric constants and phonon spectrum) are fitted exactly, or conversely the poor crystal properties may be obtained if all ion and bulk strain is eliminated.

Since the fitting result is not unique, an optimum parameter set has to be chosen deliberately according to succeeding researches. Therefore, we refine upon some parameters which are sensitive for defect formation energy calculations, whereas loosen the errors for the other. Moreover, the fitting result is concerned with the path of the optimization. In the present study, the relaxed fitting approach by Gale[8] is adopted.

Based on the optimum parameter set, the defect formation energies can then be calculated by using the division strategy of Lidiard and Norgett[9][10] incorporating with Mott-Littleton

approximation[11].

Lithium deficient non-stoichiometric $LiNbO_3$ can be imaged as the result of $Li_2O$ out-diffusion from stoichiometric one. There are different out-diffusion modes assumed in respect to corresponding defects emerging in the host $LiNbO_3$ after the removal of the $Li_2O$. By comparing three diffusion modes in terms of the energy needed for removing one $Li_2O$, one can conclude which intrinsic defect model will be energetically favorable in lithium deficient non-stoichiometric $LiNbO_3$.

## 2 Parameterization

According to the shell model, each ion is assumed to consist of an core (charge $X$, mass$\rightarrow$ $M_{ion}$) and an electron shell (charge $Y$, mass$\rightarrow$0). Therefore the number of constituent units of the crystal is doubled. The polarization of the crystal is caused by the displacements of ions and the relative displacements between cores and shells.

There are four kinds of interaction for the crystal.

(1) The interaction between shell and core belong to the same ion,

$$\phi_{s-c} = \frac{1}{2}k_{sc}|\mathbf{r}_s - \mathbf{r}_c|^2 \tag{1}$$

in which the spring constant $k_{sc}$ characterizes the harmonic coupling between the shell and core.

(2) The Coulomb interactions between ions $i$ and $j$,

$$\phi_{Coulomb} = \frac{X_iX_j}{|\mathbf{r}_{ic} - \mathbf{r}_{jc}|} + \frac{X_iY_j}{|\mathbf{r}_{ic} - \mathbf{r}_{js}|} + \frac{Y_iX_j}{|\mathbf{r}_{is} - \mathbf{r}_{jc}|} + \frac{Y_iY_j}{|\mathbf{r}_{is} - \mathbf{r}_{js}|} \quad i \neq j \tag{2}$$

where $i \neq j$ emphasizes that there is no Coulomb interaction between shell and core belong to the same ions.

(3) The short-range interactions between shells are described with Buckingham potential form:

$$\phi_{non-Coulomb}(r) = A_{ij}\exp(r/\rho_{ij}) - C_{ij}/r^6 \tag{3}$$

where $r$ is the distance between the centers of electron shells of species $i$ and $j$. Because the radius of cation is relatively small the interaction between cations is ignored. Besides, the van der Waals terms $-C_{ij}/r^6$ in anion-cation interaction is omitted too.

(4) Three body bond-bending terms are used to model the directional character of covalent bond:

$$\phi_{bend}(\theta) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}k_B(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \tag{4}$$

where $k_B$ is the bond-bending force constant, $\theta$ is the bond angle of O-Nb-O, and $\theta_0$ the equilibrium bond angle.

Accordingly to the equations listed above, there are 14 parameters involved. Since the polarizability of Li ion, $\alpha_{\mathrm{Li}} = Y_{\mathrm{Li}}^2/k_{sc}^{\mathrm{Li}}$ , is very small, so we take approximately $k_{sc}^{\mathrm{Li}} \to \infty$, $Y_{\mathrm{Li}} = 0$ . Therefore the member of undetermined parameters reduced to 12. A parameter set can be regarded as a point in the "12-dimensional parameter space".

We can properly choose an initial parameter set as a starting point and then move the point closed to the reasonable position by an optimization procedure. In the present study, "relaxed fitting" approach by Gale is employed. This approach based on displacements of the energy-minimized configuration from the experimental structure is found to be superior to conventional fitting in which zero gradients of the experimental geometry is the aim. The relaxed fitting yields the exact displacements and genuine physical properties and appears to be particularly appropriate for the modeling of low-symmetry structure[8].

In order to quantify the degree of the optimization, we define an objective function as following:

$$F \quad = \quad u\sum_i (S_{iCalc} - S_{iExpr})^2/S_{iRef}^2 + v\sum_j (P_{jCalc} - P_{jExpr})^2/P_{jRef}^2 \quad u, v > 0 \tag{5}$$

It is obviously that $F > 0$ and small $F$ implies small fitting errors or high degree optimization. $\{S\}$ and $\{P\}$ denote the quantities of crystal structure and property respectively. $u$ and $v$ are weighting factors. Generally, the precision of reproduced structure should be more emphasized in comparing with that of reproduced properties. Therefore, in the present study, we take $u = 100$ and $v = 1$.

$(S_{iCalc} - S_{iExpr})^2/S_{iRef}^2$ and $(P_{jCalc} - P_{jExpr})^2/P_{jRef}^2$ represent the fitting errors between that calculations and experiment date. In order to avoid the irrationality resulting from small denominator, we take the referential values instead of the experiment data in some cases. For instance, the fractional coordinate y(=0.3446) of the oxygen ion in hexagonal cell is many times larger than x(=0.0492) and z(=0.0647). But in practice, we take their referential values as $x_{Ref}$=$y_{Ref}$=$z_{Ref}$=1.0. Similar treatments are adopted for elastic constants(we use $10\times10^{10}$N m$^{-2}$ as their referential values).

The object function, $F$, is then minimized in terms of Davidon-Fletcher-Powell variable-metric algorithm. Since the optimization often gets stuck in local minimum, and so we have to try hundreds of initial parameter sets and then choose the globe minimum from hundreds of local minima.

Table 2. The two parameter sets of ionic interaction and shell model

| Parameters of short-range interaction | Set I | Set II | Parameters of shell model | Set I | Set II |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $A_{\mathrm{Nb-O}}$/ev | 5121.9 | 6373.6 | $Y_{\mathrm{Nb}}/\lvert e\rvert$ | -36.0 | -36.0 |
| $\rho_{\mathrm{Nb-O}}$/Å | 0.27543 | 0.27211 | $k_{sc}^{\mathrm{Nb}}/(\mathrm{evÅ}^{-2})$ | 16553. | 13374. |
| $A_{\mathrm{Li-O}}$/ev | 144.27 | 246.64 | $Y_{\mathrm{O}}/\lvert e\rvert$ | -2.5376 | -2.4660 |
| $\rho_{\mathrm{Li-O}}$ /Å | 0.35614 | 0.32554 | $k_{sc}^{\mathrm{O}}/(\mathrm{evÅ}^{-2})$ | 11.397 | 11.459 |
| $A_{\mathrm{O-O}}$/ev | 270.35 | 198.80 | Parameters of bond-bending | Set I | Set II |
| $\rho_{\mathrm{O-O}}$/Å | 0.40510 | 0.42612 | $k_B/(\mathrm{ev\ rad}^{-2})$ | 0.0 | 0.51548 |
| $C_{\mathrm{O-O}}/\mathrm{evÅ}^6$) | 11.117 | 21.277 | $\theta_0/^\circ$ | — | 90 |

Table 2 lists two parameter sets obtained, their corresponding fitting results upon crystal structure and crystal property are listed in Table 3 and 4 respectively.

Table 3: Comparison between experimental and calculated values of the structure of $LiNbO_3$ crystal in hexagonal cell.

| Structure | Exptl.[12] | Calcd. by set I | Calcd. by set II |
|---|---|---|---|
| a | 5.148 | 5.1477 | 5.2547 |
| c | 13.863 | 13.564 | 13.906 |
| $x_{Oc}$ | 0.0492 | 0.01481 | 0.01816 |
| $x_{Os}$ | 0.0492 | 0.06293 | 0.06713 |
| $y_{Oc}$ | 0.3446 | 0.37173 | 0.35736 |
| $y_{Os}$ | 0.3446 | 0.34061 | 0.36516 |
| $z_{Oc}$ | 0.0647 | 0.06385 | 0.07553 |
| $z_{Os}$ | 0.0647 | 0.07164 | 0.08350 |
| $z_{Nbs}$ | 0.0 | -0.00026 | 0.00100 |
| $z_{Li}$ | 0.2829 | 0.28738 | 0.27500 |

where a and c are lattice constants. (x, y, z) are fractional coordinates. The subscript $c$ and $s$ represent ion core and electron shell respectively. We consider the core and the shell are not coincide when crystal is under equilibrium status, *i. e.* there is a net dipole within the unit cell. The core and shell of Nb ion are in the triadaxis with coordinates (0, 0, 0) and (0, 0, $z_{Nbs}$) respectively. Because the polarization of Li ion is omitted its core and shell has the same coordinate (0, 0, $z_{Li}$).

Table 4: Comparison of experimental and calculated data of crystal properties for $LiNbO_3$

| Crystal properties | Exptl.[13] | Calcd. of Tomlinson | Calcd. of our set I | Calcd. of our set II |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $C_{11}$ | 20.3 | 25.7 | 21.30 | 21.27 |
| $C_{12}$ | 5.3 | 12.5 | 8.91 | 5.14 |
| $C_{13}$ | 7.5 | 10.6 | 6.90 | 7.47 |
| $C_{14}$ | 0.9 | -2.2 | -3.67 | 2.66 |
| $C_{33}$ | 24.5 | 27.6 | 22.28 | 25.19 |
| $C_{44}$ | 6.0 | 8.8 | 6.92 | 6.86 |
| $C_{66}$ | 7.5 | 6.6 | 6.20 | 8.06 |
| $\varepsilon_{11}(0)$ | 84.1 | 29.7 | 81.07 | 27.48 |
| $\varepsilon_{33}(0)$ | 28.1 | 61.8 | 33.56 | 40.74 |
| $\varepsilon_{11}(\infty)$ | 46.5 | 2.06* | 30.45 | 17.68 |
| $\varepsilon_{33}(\infty)$ | 27.3 | 1.83* | 21.35 | 25.68 |

where $\varepsilon_{11}(0)$, $\varepsilon_{33}(0)$ are low frequency dielectric constants, $\varepsilon_{11}(\infty)$, $\varepsilon_{33}(\infty)$ are high frequency dielectric constants, $C_{11}$, $C_{12}$, $C_{13}$, $C_{14}$, $C_{33}$, $C_{44}$, $C_{66}$ ($10^{10} Nm^{-2}$) elastic constants.

It seems that the fitting results of the crystal properties result from set I are better than that of set II. However the parameters set I leads to imaginary modes of phonons, which indicates structural unstable. Therefore parameters set I is given up and parameter set II is the accepted result to be used for intrinsic defect studies.

In comparing with the results of Tomlinson *et al.*[6] (see Table 4), two of the "most noticeable deviations", as indicated by Tomlinson *et al.*, namely the static dielectric constant

$\varepsilon_{33}(0)$ and the elastic constant $C_{14}$ are reduced in the present study. Moreover, according to the assessment of us, the calculated high frequency dielectric constant $\varepsilon_{11}(\infty)$ and $\varepsilon_{33}(\infty)$ results from the parameter set reported by Tomlinson *et al.* would be 2.06 and 1.83(marked with '*' in table 4), such deviations with magnitudes in order, are diminished considerablely as well in our study.

## 3 Lattice formation energy and point defect formation energy

The lattice formation energy of $LiNbO_3$ is deduced from parameter set II listed in Table 5. Then we extrapolate parameter set II to the empirical calculation for the lattice formation energies of $Li_2O$ and $Nb_2O_5$ as well. The results obtained are also listed in Table 5.

By using the division strategy of Lidiard and Norgett incorporating with Mott-Littleton approximation, we can then calculated the point defects in $LiNbO_3$. The formation energies of different point defects listed in Table 5 are calculated by using an improved homemade program similar to HADES[10][14]. The results are then combined to give Frankel and Schottky energies which are also represented as the total energy and the energy per defect (shown in parenthesis, i.e. the Frenkel-pair energy divided by two, the energy of the Schottky quintet in $LiNbO_3$ divided by five, the energy of the Schottky trio in $Li_2O$ divided by three and the energy of the Schottky heptad in $Nb_2O_5$ divided by seven), and are shown in Table 6.

Table 5: Some typical lattice energies and defect energies

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lattice energies | $LiNbO_3$ | $E(LiNbO_3)_{unit\ cell}$ | -183.95 ev |
| | $Li_2O$ | $E(Li_2O)_{\text{unit cell}}$ | -31.67 ev |
| | $Nb_2O_5$ | $E(Nb_2O_5)_{unit\ cell}$ | -328.10 ev |
| Formation energies of defect | Li vacancy | $E(V'_{Li})$ | 8.73 ev |
| | Li interstitial site | $E(Li_I^{\bullet})$ | -6.76 ev |
| | Nb vacancy | $E(V_{Nb}^{5'})$ | 129.46 ev |
| | Nb interstitial site | $E(Nb_I^{5\bullet})$ | -119.15 ev |
| | O vacancy | $E(V_O^{\bullet\bullet})$ | 18.83 ev |
| | O interstitial site | $E(O_I'')$ | -10.16 ev |
| | Nb antisite | $E(Nb_{Li}^{4\bullet})$ | -114.82 ev |

Table 6 The formation energies of Frenkel and Schottky defects in $LiNbO_3$ crystal.

| | |
|---|---|
| Li Frenkel pair | 1.97 (0.98) ev |
| Nb Frenkel pair | 10.31 (5.15) ev |
| O Frenkel pair | 8.67 (4.33) ev |
| $LiNbO_3$ Schottky | 10.73 (2.15) ev |
| $Li_2O$ Schottky | 4.62 (1.54) ev |
| $Nb_2O_5$ Schottky | 24.97 (3.57) ev |

# 4 Intrinsic defect structure in Li deficiency $LiNbO_3$

$Li_2O$ deficiency non-stoichiometric $LiNbO_3$ could be imaged as the result of $Li_2O$ out-diffusion from stoichiometric $LiNbO_3$. Theoretically there are three $Li_2O$ out-diffusion modes related to three intrinsic defect models respectively, namely:

$$'\mathrm{LiNbO}_3' \longleftrightarrow \mathrm{Li_2O} + 2\mathrm{V}'_{\mathrm{Li}} + \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\bullet\bullet} \quad \text{(model 1)} \tag{6}$$

$$'\mathrm{LiNbO}_3' \longleftrightarrow 3\mathrm{Li_2O} + 4\mathrm{V}'_{\mathrm{Li}} + \mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet} \quad \text{(model 2)} \tag{7}$$

$$'\mathrm{LiNbO}_3' \longleftrightarrow 3\mathrm{Li_2O} + 4\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'} + 5\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet} \quad \text{(model 3)} \tag{8}$$

The niobium vacancy ($\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}$) with effective charge of $-5|e|$ tends towards to the niobium antisite ($\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}$) with effective charge of $+4|e|$, which decreases their total formation energy. Table 7 illustrates the formation energy dependence of the distance between $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}$ and $\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}$. It can be seen that the nearest neighboring $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}$-$\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}$ pair, complex defect $[\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}]$, has the lowest formation energy. Therefore, a slight modification of (8) yields

$$'\mathrm{LiNbO}_3' \longleftrightarrow 3\mathrm{Li_2O} + 4(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet})' + \mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet} \tag{9}$$

Table 7: The relation between $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}$—$\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}$ distance and formation energy.

| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Nb}}^{5'}$—$\mathrm{Nb}_{\mathrm{Li}}^{4\bullet}$ distance | infinite | next-next nearest neighbor | next nearest neighbor | nearest neighbor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| total formation energy | 14.64ev | 12.73ev | 12.29ev | 9.98ev |

Table 8 contains our calculation results in which all the energies needed for (6)∼(9) out-diffusion modes are converted to per $Li_2O$. In order to make a comparison with the previous studies, the corresponding results reported by Donnerberg et al.[4] are listed in Table 8 as well.

Table 8 The defect energies per $Li_2O$ of four typical defect model.

| Process of out-diffusion | Eq. (6) | Eq. (7) | Eq. (8) | Eq. (9) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Calcd. by us | 4.62ev | 3.01ev | 10.89ev | 4.68ev |
| Calcd. by Donnerberg | 5.82ev | 4.56ev | 15.2 ev | 10.7ev |

The energy difference between Eq.(6) and Eq.(7) indicates the model 1 (oxygen vacancy model) is energetically unfavorable. Though the energy denoted by Eq.(9) is much less than corresponding result reported by Donnerberg *et al.*[4], it is still 1.5 times larger than the energy denoted by Eq.(7).

The fact that the energy denoted by Eq.(7) is the lowest implys the defect structure model 2 (lithium vacancy model) is energetically favorable.

## 5 Conclusion and discussion

The simple defect model 1 was rejected by several experimental evidences. Until 1993 the model 3 was favored. However, the earlier NMR studies[15] which had strongly supported the niobium vacancy model is in doubt[16].

The x-ray single-crystal diffraction and the TOF neutron powder diffraction investigation by Iyi *et al.* strongly supported the Li-site vacancy model[17]. Wilkinson *et al.* examined the congruently melting lithium niobate samples by powder x-ray diffraction techniques and found the Nb site is fully occupied[18]. The x-ray and neutron powder diffraction experiments by Zotov *et al.* shown that the Li-sites vacancy model describes best the average defect structure in congruent lithium niobate[19].

Recently, by using a formula for calculating the soft mode frequency and Curie temperature to the analysis of the defect structure, Safaryan *et al.* concluded that the lithium

vacancy model best describes the defect structure of nonstoichiometric lithium niobate[20].

According to the present empirical study, we can conclude that lithium deficiency of the $LiNbO_3$ is accompanied mainly with the formation of lithium vacancies and niobium antisite.

In comparing with the result reported by Tomlinson *et al.*, the degree of fit between the calculated crystal properties and the observed data has been improved in the present study, especially the high frequency dielectric constants. Even though there exist still obviously the disagreement between $\varepsilon_{11}(\infty)$ calculated and experimental values, it will take less effect for the polarization behavior of the ion under the electric displacement ($D$), which is important for successive studies of intrinsic defects. The reason is that the polarization density $P$ can be expressed as $P = \frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}D$ (deduced from $D = \varepsilon_0 E + P = \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon E$), and so the proportionality factors are 0.944 and 0.978 corresponding to $\varepsilon_{11}(\infty)$ calculated value of 17.1 and experimental value of 46.5 respectively.

**Acknowledgment:**

This work is supported by the National High Technology Development Program of China (Grant No. 715-001-0102).

## References

[1] H. Fay, W. J. Alford and H. M. Dess, Appl. Phys. Lett. **12**, 89(1968).

[2] P. Lerner, C. Legras, and J. P. Dumas, J. Crys. Growth **3/4**, 231(1968).

[3] S. C. Abrahams and P. Marsh, Acta Crystallogr., **B 42**, 61(1986).

[4] H. Donnerberg, S. M. Tomlinson, C. R. A. Catlow, O. F. Schirmer, Phys. Rev. **B 40**, 11909(1989).

[5] B. G. Dick and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. **112**, 90(1958).

[6] S. M. Tomlinson, C. M. Freeman, C. R. A. Catlow, H. Donnerberg, M. Leslie, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. **2 85**, 367(1989).

[7] H. Donnerberg, S. M. Tomlinson, C. R. A. Catlow, O. F. Schirmer, Phys. Rev. **B 44**, 4877(1991).

[8] J. D. Gale, Phil. Mag. **B 73**, 3(1996).

[9] A. B. Lidiard and M. J. Norgett, In 'Computational Solid State Physics' Edited by F. Herman, N. W. Dalton and T. R. Koehler, 385(Plenum Press, New York, 1972).

[10] M. J. Norgett, UKAEA Report, AERE-R7650, (1974)

[11] N. F. Mott and M. J. Littleton, Trans. Faraday Soc. **34**, 485(1938).

[12] S. C. Abrahams, J. M. Reddy, and J. L. Bernstein, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **27**, 997(1966).

[13] R. S. Weis, T. K. Gaylord, Appl. Phys. **A 37**, 191(1985).

[14] C. R. A. Catlow, R. James, W. C. Mackrodt and R. F. Stewart, Phys. Rev. **B 25**, 1006(1982).

[15] G. E. Peterson and A. Carnevale, J. Chem. Phys. **56**, 4848(1972).

[16] J. Blüml, E. Born, and Th. Metzeger, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **55**, 589(1994).

[17] N. Iyi, K, Kitamura, F. Izumi, J. K. Yamomoto, T. Hayashi, H. Asano, S. Kimura, J. Solid State Chem., **101**, 340(1992).

[18] A. P. Wilkinson, A. K. Cheetham, and R. H. Jarman, J. Appl. Phys. **74**, 3080(1993).

[19] N. Zotov, H. Boysen, F. Frey, T. Metzger, E. Born, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **55**, 145(1994).

[20] F. P. Safaryan, R. S. Feigelson, and A. M. Petrosyan, J. Appl. Phys. **85**, 8079(1999).